



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,523

11/21/2003

Kenneth J. Rothschild

AMBER-08501

3365

7590 06/18/2007  
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP  
101 Howard Street, Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER

SCHLAPKOHL, WALTER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1636

MAIL DATE


DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/719,523	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ROTHSCHILD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Walter Schlapkohl	<b>Art Unit</b> 1636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,9,11-13,16,24-29 and 31-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16,24-29 and 31-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,9 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/23/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1636

#### DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of the papers filed 3/23/2007 in which claims 1, 4-6, 9 and 11-13 were amended. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, 24-29 and 31-37 are pending. Claims 16, 24-29 and 31-37 are withdrawn. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9 and 11-13 are under examination in the instant Office action.

Any rejection of record not recited herein is hereby WITHDRAWN.

#### *Election/Restrictions*

This application contains claims drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the response filed 3/2/2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1636

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (US Patent No. 6,207,370) in view of Garvin et al (US Patent No. 6,329,180; IDS Ref. 1). This is a new rejection prompted by Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 3/23/2007.

Art Unit: 1636

Little et al teach a reaction mixture for amplifying a nucleic acid as a means of detecting and isolated a mutation in a genetic region, the reaction mixture comprising

a) a first oligonucleotide primer comprising i) a T7 promoter sequence, ii) a ribosome binding site sequence, iii) a start codon, iv) a sequence coding for a first epitope marker and v) a first region of complementarity to a region of the APC gene; and

b) a second oligonucleotide primer comprising i) at least one stop codon, and ii) a sequence encoding for a second epitope marker,

wherein said first epitope marker is SEQ ID NO: 5, a hexahistadine tag (see entire document, especially column 3, lines 10-21 and 50-58; column 4, lines 20-22; column 9, lines 38-49; column 14, lines 1-3, 31-38, 51-55; column 15, lines 19-29). Little et al also teach the use of other tags for use in their method including a 10-residue sequence from c-myc, the pFLAG system, and a 16 amino acid portion of the *Haemophilus influenza* hemagglutinin protein (see column 14, lines 45-58). The primers taught by Little et al can be used to amplify target genes which are not limited to APC, but include, e.g., BRCA1, BRCA2, dystrophin gene, CFTR, etc. (see column 4, lines 10-25). Little et al also teach that in one embodiment, an RNA molecule

Art Unit: 1636

encoding a target polypeptide can be translated in a cell-free extract, such as a reticulocyte lysate, a wheat germ extract, or a combination thereof (see column 3, lines 28-32). Finally, Little et al teach that the primer used in the reaction "typically contains 15-25 nucleotides" but may be longer or shorter depending on many factors, including temperature and source of primer and use of the method (see column 13, lines 35-44). Little et al also teach the use of mass spectrometry to determine the mass/identification of the translated protein (see, e.g., column 3, lines 50-59 and column 26, lines 30-39).

Little et al do not explicitly teach this method wherein the first and second epitope markers are different and wherein the second epitope marker is selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NOS: 6-9.

Garvin et al teach a kit and methods for detecting protein altering mutations in genes such as BRCA1 and BRCA2 (see entire document, including the Abstract and column 1, lines 21-36). The method comprises the use of a 5' primer that contains a T7 polymerase binding site, a sequence that allows translation initiation of mRNA, an in frame sequence coding for a FLAG epitope marker (Applicant's SEQ ID NO:7), and a 5' hybridization sequence "of sufficient length to allow the oligomer to hybridize to the non coding strand of the test sequence present

Art Unit: 1636

in the genomic DNA or cDNA sample and to act as a primer for PCR. Usually 20 bases are enough" (see column 3, lines 59-67 and column 4, lines 1-26 as well as Garvin et al's SEQ ID NO:2). Garvin et al also teach such method comprising the use of a 3' primer which comprises an inverse complement of sequence encoding a peptide tag and a sequence that hybridizes to a sequence at or adjacent to the 3' end of the coding strand of the test sequence. Most importantly, Garvin et al teach that in one embodiment the method comprises the use of one tag in the 5' primer and a different tag in the 3' primer and that this allows for a preferred two-step purification process wherein a ligand for either the N-terminal tag or C-terminal tag is used in the first step, and a ligand for the other peptide tag is used in the second purification step (see column 6, lines 5-36). Garvin et al further teach that this two step process will discriminate between polypeptides that result from transcription/translation of the entire amplified DNA template and those containing premature stop codons and/or those which result from internal translation initiation (ibid). Garvin et al also teach the use of mass spectrometry to determine the mass/identification of the translated protein (see, e.g., the Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to combine the

Art Unit: 1636

teachings of Little et al with regard to the reaction mixture required to detect mutations in the APC gene with the teachings of Gavin et al with regard to the methods/reaction mixtures required to detect mutations in, e.g., the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes because both Little et al and Gavin et al teach the use of PCR amplification and *in vitro* translation of epitope-tagged protein products in order to determine whether protein-altering mutations are present in a gene.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Little et al with those of Garvin et al because Garvin et al teach that the use of a second tag, different from the first, would allow for a two step purification process that could distinguish between full length protein products and those which were truncated and/or those which were the product of internal translation initiation. This is desirable because both Gavin et al and Little et al teach that the mass of the protein could be easily assessed via mass spectrometry in order to detect protein-altering mutations.

Based upon the teachings of the cited references, the high skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result when combining the teachings of Little et al with those of Garvin et al.



Art Unit: 1636

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (cited above) in view of Garvin et al (cited above) as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5, 9 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Elion et al (*Current Protocols in Molecular Biology*, Unit 3.17, pages 3.17.1-3.17.10, 1993). This is a new rejection prompted by Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 3/23/2007.

As explained above, Little et al in view of Garvin et al teach a PCR reaction mixture for amplifying a nucleic acid as a means of detecting and isolating a mutation in a genetic region, the reaction mixture comprising

a) a first oligonucleotide primer comprising i) a T7 promoter sequence, ii) a ribosome binding site sequence, iii) a start codon, iv) a sequence coding for a first epitope marker and v) a first region of complementarity to a region of the APC gene; and

b) a second oligonucleotide primer comprising i) at least one stop codon, and ii) a sequence encoding for a second epitope marker,

Art Unit: 1636

wherein said first epitope marker is SEQ ID NO: 5, a hexahistadine tag (see Little et al especially at column 3, lines 10-21 and 50-58; column 4, lines 20-22; column 9, lines 38-49; column 14, lines 1-3, 31-38, 51-55; column 15, lines 19-29) and the second epitope marker can be a FLAG tag such as Applicant's SEQ ID NO:7 (see Garvin et al at column 3, lines 59-67; column 4, lines 1-26; as well as Garvin et al's SEQ ID NO:2). Little et al in view of Garvin et al further teach such a reaction mixture wherein the reaction mixture includes APC template and wherein the 3' primer comprises a second region of complementarity to the template (see Little et al at column 4, line 22 and Garvin et al at column 4, lines 40-42).

Little et al in view of Garvin et al do not teach such a reaction mixture wherein the second region of complementarity is greater than 15 bases in length.

Elion teaches critical parameters for PCR reactions for constructing recombinant DNA molecules. Elion teaches that with regard to the design of primers, sequences with 16 to 20 nucleotides of homology to the target sequence should be chosen (see page 3.17.4, 1<sup>st</sup> column, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph). Elion also teaches that "longer oligonucleotide of ~25 nucleotides should be used for AT-rich regions" and that in instances where genomic DNA is used as the source of target DNA, "the oligonucleotide

Art Unit: 1636

primers should contain at least 20 nucleotides of homology to the target DNA to ensure that they anneal specifically" (ibid).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Little et al in view of Garvin et al with those of Elion because Little et al in view of Garvin et al teach a PCR reaction mixture for the amplification of genes to detect protein-affecting mutations and Elion teaches well-established protocols with regard to parameters involved in PCR reactions, including primer design.

Given the teachings provided by Little et al and Garvin et al regarding the use of PCR reaction mixtures to detect protein-altering mutations, one of ordinary skill in the art interested in practicing the inventions of Little et al and Garvin et al would have been motivated to turn to the teachings of Elion et al for technical assistance in the design of primers for successful practice.

Based upon the teachings of the cited references, the high skill of one of ordinary skill in the art, the well-established PCR protocols established by the time of Applicant's filing, and absent evidence to the contrary, there would have been a reasonable expectation of success to result when combining the teachings of Little et al in view of Garvin et al with those of Elion.

Art Unit: 1636

**Conclusion**

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 3/23/2007 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to the Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94

Art Unit: 1636

(December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone number for the Group is (571) 273-8300. Note: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all

Art Unit: 1636

patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent applications to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.


For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at (800) 786-9199.

Any inquiry concerning rejections or objections in this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter Schlapkohl whose telephone number is (571) 272-4439. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Joseph Woitach can be reached at (571) 272-0739.

Walter A. Schlapkohl, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1636

June 6, 2007

  
DAVID GUZO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER